SINGLE BENCH

(1) C.S. 1001 (3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Writ Petition No. 2599/2006

PETITIONER

Hira Singh Rawat
S/o Sri Amru By Caste Rawat,
Aged about 49 years, R/o Village- Sidagidi Jamali, Post- Pacheda, Tah & Distt- Mahasamund(C.G.)
Ex. Dailywage employee PWD Department, Mahasamund (C.G.)

R.H. No. 2654/06 Presented by Shri S.A. Dehu dated 12/5/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENT

1) State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Public Work Department D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur(C.G.)

2) State of Madhya Pradesh Through The Chief Secretary, Vallabh Bawan, Bhopla (M.P.)

RECEIVED-COPY 12/5/06 CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

3) The Executive Engineer Public Work Department, Division Mahasamund, District- Mahasamund (C.G.)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER APARNA MALVIYA 06/05/06 Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

4) Sub Divisional Officer, Public Work Department, Mahasamund (C.G.)

5) Hanuman Netam S/o Sri Balmat Netam, C/o Sub Divisional Officer, P.W.D. Department Bhawan & Sadak, Sub Division Mahasamund, District- Mahasamund (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक WP..2599/06..... **सन् 200**

(35)

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	13.6.2006:- Shri S.K. Dadsena, counsel for the petitioner. Heard. By the present petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India the petitioner has made a prayer that it be declared that the petitioner is entitled for reinstatement on the Gangman post. The case of the petitioner is that he was posted as Daily Wages in the year 1998 by the Public Works Department, Mahasamund. Respondent No.5 also joined as Daily Wages employee in the PWD Department after the petitioner. Thereafter the services of petitioner and respondent No.5 were terminated vide Annexure-P/3 dated 23rd February 2000. However, respondents No.1 to 4 have reinstated respondent No.5 whereas, the petitioner has not been reinstated. The petitioner made a representation to the Public Works Department on 6-3-2003 but nothing has been done. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted the same thing which has been mentioned in the petition. Perusal of the order Annexure-P/1 dated 30th March 2000 which was issued to the petitioner shows that certain daily wages employees were appointed for specific work and since the work for which the daily wagers were appointed was completed, therefore, by order Annexure-P/1 it was decided that the services of those daily wagers who were appointed after 31-12-88 would be terminated w.e.f. 1.4.2000. No other material indicating that the petitioner was appointed against some regular post has been placed on record. The petitioner was appointed against specific work and that work was over, therefore, his services were terminated, as such the petition of the petitioner is devoid of any merit.	

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

(36)

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	As far as grievance of the petitioner that respondent No.5 was removed along with the petitioner, however, he was reinstated later on, is concerned, nothing has been placed on record showing that how he has been appointed, whether he has been reinstated on the same terms and condition or he was appointed for some another work for a specific period on daily wages. Therefore, the petitioner has not been able to make out a case for interference by this Court. The writ petition is, therefore, liable to be dismissed and it is hereby dismissed at the admission stage itself. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	

19.8.08

1.8.08